

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-10, 27-32, 34 and 41-54 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 5 and 28 have been canceled. Claims 1, 27, 29-30, 32, 41, 44-46, 49, 51 and 54 have been amended. New claims 55 and 56 have been added. As a result, claims 1-4, 6-10, 27, 29-32, 34, 41-56 are pending for examination with claims 1, 27 and 54 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nishio (US 7,316,022 B2) in view of Howard et al. (US 6,823,526 B2). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to the extent it is maintained for the claims as amended.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “a monitor component that detects arrival and departure of the network device on the network, whereby the computing device can determine when the network device is accessible to the application component.” The claim has been also amended to recite “an association component for forming an association between the computing device and one or more other network devices based on user input.” In addition, claim 1 now recites “a display component that displays to a user of the computing device an interface indicating associated network devices, the interface selectively including a representation of the network device in a format indicating the network device is available based on an output of the monitoring component.” Support for these amendments may be found through the application as filed, including at [0031,0032, 0034 and 0039].¹

Applicants respectfully submit that Nishio and Howard, whether considered singly or in combination, do not disclose a system that meets all the limitations of claim 1. The present application describes generally management and control of networked devices [0002]. The application describes a monitoring component that can detect arrival and departure of network devices. Based on user input and association may be formed with one or more of these devices.

¹ The paragraph numbers are based on the numbering of paragraphs in patent publication US 2005/0108369A1.

Moreover, the management and control functions of the system may be implemented in part based on a graphical user interface that can show available ones of these associated network devices [0031,0032, 0034 and 0039]. Though Nishio describes installing a network printer, it does not describe forming an association based on user input. The reference also does not describe indicating associated network devices that are available or selective display based on an output of a monitoring component.

Howard does not relate to management of network devices. Rather, Howard relates to installing an external device coupled through a cable to a host system. Even if the references were combined, there is no basis to assert that the combination would have the combination of components recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 27-32, 34, and 41-49 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nishio (US 7,316,022 B2) in view of Meenan et al. (US 7,283,505 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to the extent it is maintained for the claims as amended.

Independent claim 27 has been amended to recite “receiving, through a user interface on the computer, information defining a credential” in combination with “associating the computer peripheral with the computer at least by authenticating between the computer peripheral and the computer using the credential.” Support for this amendment can be found throughout the application as filed, including at [0034].

Nishio and Meenan, whether considered alone or in combination, do not meet all limitations of claim 27. The Office Action concedes that Nishio does not teach associating a computer peripheral with a computer by authenticating. Rather, Meenan is cited for meeting this limitation. However, the cited passages of Meenan relate to a client device that authenticates with a host system through a home networking gateway such that wireless access points could be configured (see, Title).

Even if there was a reason to apply this approach in a network as described in Nishio, there is no reason to assert that the techniques for configuring wireless access points in Meenan would be applied for communication between a computer and a printer as in Nishio. Accordingly, even if the references were combined, the combination would not meet all limitations of claim 27.

The Examiner has rejected claims 53 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nishio (US 7,316,022 B2) in view of Howard et al. (US 6,823,526 B2) further in view of Meenan et al. (US 7,283,505 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to the extent it is maintained over the claims as amended.

Independent claim 54 has been amended to recite “obtaining a credential based on user input received through a user interface on the computer” in combination with “accessing the computer peripheral using channel security.”

Support for the amendments may be found throughout the application as filed, including at paragraph [0034].

For reasons that should be apparent from the discussion of Nishio, Howard and Meenan in connection with independent claims 1 and 27, above, it should be apparent that the references, even if combined would not meet all limitations of independent claim 54 as amended. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 54 should be withdrawn.

New Claims 55 and 56

New claims 55 and 56 have been added to further define applicant’s contribution to the art. Support for new claims 55 and 56 may be found in the application as filed, including at [0039].

Claims 55 and 56 depend from claim 1 and should be allowed at least based on their dependency. The claims also recite limitations that are not shown in the references and provide further reasons that the claims should be allowed.

General Comments on Dependent Claims

Each of the dependent claims depends from a base claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, and Applicants believe that it is unnecessary at this time to argue the allowability of each of the dependent claims individually. Applicants do not, however, necessarily concur with the interpretation of the dependent claims as set forth in the Office Action, nor do Applicants concur that the basis for the rejection of any of the dependent claims is proper. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to specifically address the patentability of the dependent claims in the future, if deemed necessary.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 23/2825 under Docket No. M1103.70668US00 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: June 16, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By

Edmund J. Walsh

Registration No.: 32950

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

617.646.8000